



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

unnecessary; but simultaneously it emasculates the statute which permitted the attachment of the stock. The difficulty in the principal case can be avoided by a statutory provision that only the certificates shall be attachable. See UNIFORM TRANSFER OF STOCK ACT, § 13. Such provision is consonant with business custom which regards the certificate as the *res*. See *Puget Sound Bank v. Matther*, 60 Minn. 362, 363, 62 N. W. 396, 397.

CORPORATIONS — PROMOTERS — CONTRACTS MADE FOR CORPORATION TO BE FORMED. — Certain promoters of a corporation to be formed agreed, *inter alia*, that if the plaintiff would transfer his interest in some mine property to one of the promoters, as trustee for himself and his associates, to be by him transferred to the corporation when formed, the corporation would give the plaintiff a one fifth interest in the completed enterprise. The plaintiff brought this bill against the corporation and the promoters for specific performance of the contract. *Held*, that it be granted. *Wallace v. Eclipse Pocahontas Coal Co. et al.*, 98 S. E. 293 (W. Va.).

In England it is settled that a corporation cannot ratify or adopt a contract made by promoters in its behalf before incorporation. *In re Northumberland Ave. Hotel Co.*, 33 Ch. D. 16; *Natal Land Co. v. Pauline Colliery Syndicate*, [1904] A. C. 120. The English rule is not without support in the United States. See *Abbott v. Hapgood*, 150 Mass. 248, 252, 22 N. E. 907, 908. But some American jurisdictions allow ratification on such facts. *Oakes v. Cattaraugus Water Co.*, 143 N. Y. 430, 38 N. E. 461; *Kaeppler v. Redfield Creamery Co.*, 12 S. D. 483, 81 N. W. 907. Other states rely on a doctrine of adoption. *McArthur v. Times Printing Co.*, 150 Minn. 319. See *Robbins v. Bangor Ry. Co.*, 100 Me. 496, 501. Theoretically, the English rule seems correct. On the other hand, the result reached in the American cases is the desirable one. To reach this result without overthrowing fundamental principles of agency, several theories have been suggested. If there has been a novation effected between the corporation and the third party, all agree that the corporation is bound. *Snow v. Thompson Oil Co.*, 59 Pa. St. 209. See *Oldham v. Mt. Sterling Imp. Co.*, 103 Ky. 529, 531. Another theory advanced is that the original contract may be regarded as a continuing offer which, if not withdrawn, may be accepted by the corporation. *Pratt v. Oshkosh Match Co.*, 89 Wis. 406, 62 N. W. 84. See 14 HARV. L. REV. 536. Neither of these suggestions help to support the decision in the principal case. The bill is brought for the enforcement of the agreement made with the promoters and not of any contract made by the corporation itself.

CRIMINAL LAW — CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OF STATE AND UNITED STATES — SEDITION ACT. — A New Jersey statute made it a crime to incite hostility against the United States (N. J. LAWS, 1918, chap. 44, § 2). *Held*, statute is constitutional. *State v. Tachin*, 106 Atl. 145 (N. J.).

In the absence of a federal statute on the subject, a state may enact that an offense primarily against the United States is an offense against the state as well. *Halter v. Nebraska*, 205 U. S. 34. A state and the United States may have concurrent jurisdiction over a crime against both sovereignties, where the crime is covered by a federal statute and the state statute does not interfere with its operation. *State v. Holm*, 139 Minn. 267, 166 N. W. 181; see 40 STAT. AT L. 219, chap. 75, § 1. Each sovereign punishes the offense against itself.

CRIMINAL LAW — FORMER JEOPARDY — IDENTITY OF OFFENSES. — The defendant was indicted for a homicide that was the result of violence in the perpetration of a robbery. He had been previously convicted of the robbery, and he set up this former conviction as a defense. *Held*, a valid defense. *State v. Mowser*, 106 Atl. 416 (N. J.).